```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
10
    JEFFREY MORGAN,
11
12
                   Plaintiff,
                                        No. CV-06-1725-HU
13
         V.
14
    PITNEY BOWES INC.
                                        FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION
15
                   Defendant.
16
    David J. Hollander
17
    HOLLANDER LEBENBAUM & GANNICOTT
    1500 S.W. First Avenue
18
    Suite 700
    Portland, Oregon 97201-5860
19
         Attorney for Plaintiff
20
    Carol J. Bernick
21
    Nicholas A. Kampars
    DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
22
    1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue
    Suite 2300
23
    Portland, Oregon 97201-5630
24
         Attorneys for Defendant
2.5
    HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:
26
         Plaintiff Jeffrey Morgan brings this employment action against
27
    defendant Pitney Bowes, Inc.
                                      Presently before the Court is
28
    defendant's motion to dismiss or alternatively, to compel.
    1 - FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION
```

Case 3:06-cv-01725-HU Document 15 Filed 06/13/07 Page 1 of 3

Defendant's dismissal motion is based on an argument that plaintiff has failed to timely prosecute his case, has failed to timely produce discovery, and has failed to comply with Court-ordered timelines for production of initial disclosures. The motion is based on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Alternatively, defendant moves to compel production of responses to interrogatories served several months ago, and the initial disclosures.

Plaintiff did not respond to the motion. At the time set for oral argument on the motion, plaintiff's counsel represented to the Court that his client intended to dismiss the case with prejudice. Based on this representation, I recommend that the motion to dismiss be granted for the reasons stated in the motion.

CONCLUSION

I recommend that defendant's motion to dismiss (#10) be granted.

## SCHEDULING ORDER

The above Findings and Recommendation will be referred to a United States District Judge for review. Objections, if any, are due June 28, 2007. If no objections are filed, review of the Findings and Recommendation will go under advisement on that date.

22 / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 23 / / /
- 24 / / /
- 25 / / /
- 26 / / /
- 27 / / /
- 28 / / /
  - 2 FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

## Case 3:06-cv-01725-HU Document 15 Filed 06/13/07 Page 3 of 3

1	If objections are filed, a response to the objections is due
2	July 12, 2007, , and the review of the Findings and Recommendation
3	will go under advisement on that date.
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	Dated this <u>13th</u> day of <u>June</u> , 2007.
6	
7	/a / Donnia Tomas Hubal
8	/s/ Dennis James HubelDennis James Hubel
9	United States Magistrate Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	3 - FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION